



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

# THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY

Entered as second-class matter November 18, 1907, at the Post Office, New York, N. Y., under the Act of Congress of March 1, 1879

VOL. III

NEW YORK, NOVEMBER 20, 1909

No. 7

In looking over a mass of clippings which I have made at various times I came upon an extract from The Nation of January 7 last, a part of an article on the earthquake in Sicily last year. This clipping has its suggestions for the student of Latin literature; it throws light for instance on Horace C.I.I. 9-10 (see especially Kiessling's notes there)

illum, si proprio condidit horreo  
quidquid de Libycis verritur areis.

The enormous loss of life was due in part to the congestion of the population. Italy as a whole supports 305 inhabitants to its every square mile. In Sicily the ratio is 375; and about unhappy Messina the ratio rose to 456. We think of Sicily as so exclusively an agricultural country—the land of wheat, oil, and citron—that it is surprising to find over one-fourth of its population of some 3,800,000 congregated in cities having more than 25,000 inhabitants. The soil is parcelled out among great landowners, holders of the ancient *latifundia*, who, with their tenants and sub-tenants, crowd together in the cities, when the week's or the season's cultivation is done. That a tremendous earthquake coming upon such human congestion should work immense loss of life, was inevitable.

Any one familiar with Juvenal's third Satire, with the number of *insulae* in ancient Rome, or with the discussions of the population of Rome (see e. g. Friedländer, *Sittengeschichte*<sup>6</sup>, 1.58-70, or Story, *Roba di Roma*, 574-599), will appreciate at once the applicability of this extract from The Nation to the conditions of life in ancient Rome. I may add here that in the translation of Friedländer's great work which is in course of publication by Messrs. E. P. Dutton and Co. (two volumes have thus far appeared; see THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 2.39, 3.52) excursions such as that on the population of Rome have been omitted; announcement is made, however, that they will be grouped together in translation in a fourth volume.

C. K.

In THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 2.185 I protested against the doctrine taught in various quarters that in certain Latin sentences we have examples of *ut non* instead of *ne* in final clauses. I have noticed lately some sentences sufficiently akin to those discussed in the little article referred to above to be quoted here. Cf., for example, Cicero De Officiis 2.62 Propensior benignitas esse debet in calamitosos, nisi forte erunt digni calamitate. In iis tamen qui se adiuvare volent non ne adfligantur, sed ut altiore gradum ascendunt, restricti omnino esse

nullo modo debemus, sed in deligendis idoneis iudicium et diligentiam adhibere; 3.61 Ita nec ut emat melius nec ut vendat quicquam simulabit aut dissimulabit vir bonus.

Kindred phenomena are to be found, *mutatis mutandis*, in Greek. Let us examine Sophocles Antigone 31-36 (Antigone is the speaker):

τοιαῦτά φασι τὸν ἀγαθὸν Κρέοντα σοὶ  
κάμοι, λέγω γὰρ κάμει, κηρύξαντ' ἔχειν,  
καὶ δεῦρο νέεσθαι ταῦτα τοῖσι μὴ εἰδόσιν  
σαφῇ προκηρύξοντα, καὶ τὸ πρᾶγμ' ἄγειν  
οὐχ ὡς παρ' οὐδέν, ἀλλ' ὅς ἂν τούτων τι δρᾷ 35  
φόνον προκείσθαι δημόλευστον ἐν πόλει.

I have in mind especially verse 35. The idea of command, twice clearly brought out, in verses 32 and 34, would naturally have lead to *μή*, not *οὐ*, in 36, especially when we take into account also the adjacent infinitive in 34. Why then do we have *οὐχ* after all? What was said in THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 2.185 about *ut . . . non . . . sed* in Cicero Cat. 1.23 applies here. *οὐχ . . . ἀλλ' = non . . . sed*, and the thought here is essentially affirmative in its movement; in a word *non . . . sed*, *οὐ . . . ἀλλά* are capital ways of uttering a vigorous affirmative. The words embraced by these particles in Latin and Greek both make a little entity complete in itself, unaffected by the rest of the sentence. We might rewrite Sophocles's words, meter apart, thus: καὶ τὸ πρᾶγμα περὶ πλείστον ποιέσθαι, καὶ γὰρ ὅς ἂν . . . ἐν πόλει.

All this seems to me quite elementary. But I note that so good a scholar as Professor Humphreys, in his fine edition of the Antigone, takes a view of our passage which I am obliged to regard as quite erroneous and as hopelessly bewildering to a young student. His note runs as follows: "οὐχ ὡς παρ' οὐδέν: This clause is Antigone's, and the neg. really belongs to προκηρύξοντα, hence οὐ and not μή. Cf. Thuc. i. 39.2 καὶ δεῦρο ἵκονσιν . . . ἡμᾶς νῦν ἀξιοῦντες, οὐ ξυμμαχεῖν, ἀλλὰ ξυναδικεῖν. Now I can, should I be obliged to do so, interpret the Thucydides passage as equal to ἡμᾶς νῦν οὐκ ἀξιοῦντες ξυμμαχεῖν, ἀλλὰ ξυναδικεῖν, but I cannot, at least naturally, explain Antigone's words here as equal to οὐ προκηρύξοντα τὸ πρᾶγμ' ἄγειν ὡς παρ' οὐδέν, ἀλλ', etc.

I note finally that both Jebb and Campbell apparently thought this whole matter too obvious to require explanation.

C. K.